



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,155	12/23/2005	Johann Doppstadt	P70997US0	6582
136	7590	10/21/2008	EXAMINER	
JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC			KUMAR, KALYANAVENKA K	
400 SEVENTH STREET N.W.				
SUITE 600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20004			3653	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/562,155	DOPPSTADT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KALYANAVENKATESHWARE KUMAR	3653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 26-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 26-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 26-27, 29, 31, 32, 34-38, 40-41, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Dube et al. ("Dube") (U.S. Publication 2002/0056668 with citations to US Patent 6,843,376)**.

3. Dube (Fig. 1-8) teaches a trommel screen machine, comprising at least one revolving screening drum (13), at least one drive (Fig. 2 showing common drive M for the screening drum and the disc screen), a feeding hopper (45; col. 7), at least one disc screen (col. 8 teaching disc screen 11 shown as "on" and adapted to the hopper 45 at an angle alpha in fig. 2 with fig. 4 showing replacement vibrator screen and fig. 5 showing at least two driven shafts with comb-like discs), at least one collecting device and transport device (showing transport chute at end of screen and pivotal transport conveyor 51 in fig. 3), a second collecting and transport device (55, paragraph 0049), and a conveying device for receipt of oversized particles moving in a second direction

from the screening drum and the disc screen, said second direction being opposite to said first direction (paragraph 0049, Figs. 1-3). Further, Applicant is respectfully reminded that claim language consisting of functional language and/or intended use phrasing is given little, if any, patentable weight as the apparatus must merely be capable of functioning, or being used, as claimed. See MPEP 2112.02, 2114. Here, the second collecting and transport device for receipt of goods based on size of openings of the screening drum.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 28, 33, 39 and 42-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dube in view of **Mclean (US 2,055,630)**, **Davis (Us 6,318,560)**, and **Paladin (US 6,986,425)**.

6. Dube as set forth above teaches all that is claimed except for expressly teaching that the disc or vibrating screen is capable of being folded or turned away and that at least one adjusting device is provided by means of which the angle (alpha) of the disc screen is adjustable, wherein the disc screen comprises various features, such as direct drive, polygon discs, exchangeable discs with clamps, discs with at least one exchangeable perimeter nap of different shapes. These features, however, are well-

known in the disc screening arts. Here, it is noted that Dube already teaches the essence of Applicant's invention--the use of an initial disc screen prior to a drum screen, thus the replacement of the disc screen with other well known types of disc screens can merely be regarded as an obvious modification. For instance, Mclean teaches that an adjustable (i.e., turnable) disc with direct drive shafts is quite old in the art (Fig. 1-8), Davis teaches that disc screens with replaceable shafts with different shapes and spacing of discs is well known (Fig. 1-8; Abstract) and Paladin further teaches that adjustable disc screens with different shapes is well known (Fig. 1-15). Moreover, it would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the base reference with these prior art teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. The rationale for this obviousness determination can be found in the prior art itself as Dube expressly teaches the replacement of the respective screens with any other type of well-known screen (col. 8) as it is a well known in the screening arts to adjust the angle and type of screen based on the objects to be screened. Further, the modification to arrive at the claimed invention would merely involve the substitution/addition of well-known elements with no change in their respective functions (i.e., screen). Moreover, the use of prior art elements according to their functions is a predictable variation that would yield predictable results, and thus cannot be regarded as a non-obvious modification when the modification is already commonly implemented in the prior art. Further, the prior art discussed and cited demonstrates the level of sophistication of one with ordinary skill in the art and that these modifications would be well within this skill level. Therefore, it

would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Dube for the reasons set forth above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 6/4/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. **Specification Objections**

9. Regarding specification objections, the objections have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment.

10. **Claim Objections**

11. Regarding claim objections, the objections have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment.

12. **Rejections under USC 112**

13. Regarding rejections under USC 112, the rejections have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment.

14. **Rejections under USC 102**

15. Regarding Applicant's argument, "The solution of the present invention differs accordingly from that of the cited art by the fact that the disc screen is arranged actually exactly on the trommel screen machine so that the required space is reduced considerably. As additionally the feed funnels are arranged on the housing of the trommel screen itself, the required space is reduced considerably compared with the solution by Dube," the Examiner disagrees. The Examiner asserts that claim 26 states,

"the disc screen being arranged on the feeding hopper," and claim 52 states, "said disc screen being mounted on the feeding hopper," and, therefore, not arranged actually exactly on the trammel screen machine, but connected to the on the machine.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
17. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kalyan Kumar whose telephone number is 571-272-8102. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00AM-3:30PM.
19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Mackey can be reached on 571-272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3653

20. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrick H. Mackey/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3653

Kalyan Kumar

Examiner

Art Unit 3653